REMARKS

SUMMARY:

The subject application sets forth claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29, of which claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent claims. Original claims 1-20 stand rejected as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,373 (Apte et al.) Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejection and request consideration of the present amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) REJECTION (CLAIMS 1-20):

Original claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,373 (Apte et al). Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of such alleged anticipation.

Present claims 1 and 16 are directed to respective systems for providing interaction between a client and a server. Such systems include features related to a bean, including at least one property that identifies or is representative of a bean, a property field that describes usage of an attribute for the bean, and a type that describes the bean. Present claim 1 further includes a means for utilizing the bean as a cache entity, and present claim 16 further includes a cache for storing transient values for the at least one property for subsequent retrieval after a first use.

Numbered pages 3 and 4 of the June 30, 2004 Office Action set forth that Apte et al. include all elements of original claim 1 (and similarly original claim 16). However, present claims 1 and 16 are amended to include additional respective features that are not disclosed in Apte et al. More particularly, the means for utilizing the bean as a cache entity as set forth in present claim 1 and the cache for storing transient values for the at least one property as set forth in present claim 16 are not disclosed in Apte et al.

Applicants note that the "beanified" systems set forth in claims 1 and 16 provide many advantages over other object-oriented computer communication systems. Not only can the bean-related features of such systems help provide simplified transaction handling between client and server components, but they can also facilitate utilization of

beans as cache entities. Non-transient property values can be cached on a client side while being fetched for the very first time. When property values are subsequently requested, the values are not again requested from a server via a network, but are instead fetched from the local cache. The cache-in properties of the beans, which are fetched via the network, are summarized into property sets. The sets may be fetched as one network package, thus increasing performance because the compounding of data to bigger network packages lowers the overall transfer rate. See the original disclosure at page 7, lines 5-17 of the original subject application.

Applicants respectfully submit that present claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Apte et al. With regard to claims 2-3, 5 and 21-22, such claims variously depend from otherwise allowable claim 1 and further limit same. As such, claims 2-3, 5 and 21-22 should also be allowed. With regard to claims 17-18, 20 and 28-29, such claims variously depend from otherwise allowable present claim 16 and further limit same. As such, claims 17-18, 20 and 28-29 should also be allowed. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of the above claim characterizations.

Present claim 6 is directed to a method for providing interaction between a client and a server, including such steps as automatically providing at least one property that a bean represents, automatically providing a property field that describes the usage of an attribute for the bean, and automatically providing a type that describes the bean. Claim 11 is directed to a computer readable medium for providing interaction between a client and a server, including such elements as logic that automatically provides at least one property that a bean represents, logic that automatically provides a property field that describes usage of an attribute for the bean, and logic that automatically provides a type that describes the bean.

Both present claims 6 and 11 set forth features regarding the automatic generation of a bean in accordance with aspects of the present subject matter. As described in the subject application with respect to Figs. 4 and 5, the automatic generation of beans (e.g., jellybeans) may include several detailed steps and features, including those outlined in the flow chart of Fig. 5. Automatic generation of such bean-related aspects helps provide a system and related method for client/server interaction

that is quickly and easily configured as well as highly flexible and scanable.

Numbered pages 3 and 4 of the June 30, 2004 Office Action allege that original claims 6 and 11 are anticipated by Apte et al. Such reference is directed to a method and system for persisting beans as container-managed fields. The beans in such a container-managed environment are not generated automatically as in the various steps and features of present claims 6 and 11. In contrast, the beans of Apte et al. are created in one of two ways: by direct action of the client in which a "create" method is called on the bean's home interface, or by some other action that adds data to the database that the bean type represents (see col. 16, lines 40-45). Even though for some beans (e.g., stateful session beans) a container can automatically save and retrieve a bean's state in the process of managing instance pools of stateful session beans (see col. 16, lines 20-22), such automated feature does not concern or suggest the initial automatic generation of beans in accordance with present claims 6 and 11. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Apte et al. fail to disclose or suggest all elements of present claims 6 and 11.

Applicants further submit that modification of the technology set forth in Apte et al. to provide for automatic generation of the beans would change the principle of operation of such reference. More particularly, the subject application sets forth that beans for containers are not generated automatically because they shall be implemented by an adaptor so they can be used in models (see original disclosure, page 5, lines 8-10). Since the beans disclosed in Apte et al. are for containers, then they cannot be generated automatically. Applicants note that according to §2143.01 of the MPEP, a proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose or change the principle of operation of a reference.

Based on the present amendments and the above remarks, Applicants submit Apte et al. do not disclose or suggest all elements of present claims 6 and 11. Furthermore, modification of such reference to include all elements of such claims would change the principle of operation of the reference. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the alleged unpatentability of claims 6 and 11. Also, with regard to claims 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15 and 24-27, such claims variously depend

from otherwise allowable claims 6 and/or 11 and further limit same. As such, claims 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15 and 24-27 should also be allowed and acknowledgement of the same is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION:

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29, is in complete condition for issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance, and action to such effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience should only minor issues remain after consideration of this response in order to permit early resolution of same.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.A.

Date: December 30, 2004

RICHARD M. MOOSE
Reg. No.: 31,226
Customer ID No.: 22827

Telephone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342